

REMARKS

Claims 6, 15 and 20 have been amended. Claims 6-20 remain for consideration. No new matter has been added.

The objections and rejections shall be taken up in the order presented in the Official Action.

1-4. Claims 6-20 currently stand rejected for allegedly being obvious in view of U.S. Patent 6,611,537 to Edens (hereinafter “Edens”).

Claim 6

Amended claim 6 recites a motor vehicle optical ring network that includes:

“an optical data line configured in a ring network;
at least one data source connected to the optical data line, and provides compressed data onto the optical data line; and
at least one data sink connected to the optical data line and comprising a playback transducer, and that receives the compressed data from the optical data line, where the data sink includes a bit stream decoder to decompress the received compressed data and provide a decompressed data signal indicative thereof to the playback transducer;
where the at least one data sink also includes a control unit that selectively adapts the decompression of the received compressed data by the bit stream decoder based upon the compression format of the received compressed data, where the format of the received compressed data may be one of a plurality of compression formats.”

As amended, the data sink of claim 6 comprises: (i) a playback transducer, (ii) a bit stream decoder and (iii) a playback device.

The Official Action of January 3, 2007 contends “...it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Edens’ ring network with an optical data line connected to multimedia PC or electronics devices in order to support high speed

signal propagation or high bandwidth to any transmission media as taught by Edens.” (Official Action, pg. 3). The Official Action contends there are two constructions of Edens that render the claimed invention obvious. Specifically, there are two constructions since the Official Action states *“a playback transducer (CD/DVD player or multimedia PC of Fig. 1)”* (emphasis added, Official Action, pg. 2). The first construction reads the claimed playback transducer onto one of the CD/DVD players disclosed in Edens, and reads the claimed controller onto the multimedia PC 170. The second construction reads both the claimed controller and the playback transducer onto the multimedia PC 170 of Edens. We shall discuss each construction separately, and why each construction of Edens is incapable of rendering the claimed invention obvious.

THE CLAIMED INVENTION IS NON-OBVIOUS OVER THE FIRST CONSTRUCTION OF EDENS

In the first construction, the Official Action reads the claimed playback transducer onto one of the CD/DVD players disclosed in Edens and reads the claimed controller unit onto the multimedia PC 170. This rejection is improper for several reasons. First, a CD/DVD player can not be construed as the claimed playback transducer (e.g., a loudspeaker or a TV). A CD/DVD player is a data source that requires an audio or video playback transducer (e.g., a loudspeaker or a TV) in order to provide information to the user. In the context of the present invention, the claimed playback transducer receives decompressed data for playback – a CD/DVD player is incapable of receiving decompressed data for playback. Edens, and in particular a construction of Edens where the claimed playback transducer is read onto the CD/DVD player of Edens, is incapable of rendering the claimed invention obvious since there is no teaching or suggestion of the CD/DVD player of Edens receiving decompressed data for playback. In fact, Edens even teaches that the CD/DVD players 150, 160 provide MPEG2 compressed data that is decompressed by the decoders 151, 161, respectively for

playback on their associated TV 155, 165, respectively. Hence, the contention in the Official Action that the claimed playback transducer reads on the CD/DVD player is incorrect since the CD/DVD player is not a playback transducer, and the CD/DVD player does not receive decompressed data for playback. In fact, Edens teaches that the CD/DVD players 150, 160 only provide data. Specifically, Edens states “...other source devices include CD/DVD players 150 (in room 102) and 160 (in room 106)”. (emphasis added, col. 13, line 67 – col. 14, line 1). There is no teaching in Eden of the CD/DVD players 150, 160 receiving decompressed data for playback as recited in the claimed invention.

THE CLAIMED INVENTION IS NON-OBVIOUS OVER THE SECOND CONSTRUCTION OF EDENS

In the second construction, the Official Action reads both the claimed playback transducer and the claimed control unit onto the multimedia PC 170 of Edens (see Official Action, pgs. 2-3). This rejection is also improper.

Claim 6 recites that the data sink comprises: (i) the bit stream decoder, (ii) the playback transducer and (iii) the control unit. The Official Action reads both the claimed playback transducer and the claimed control unit onto the multimedia PC (see Official Action, pgs. 2-3). As set forth in claim 6, the claimed playback transducer receives decompressed data for playback. However, in Edens the multimedia PC 170 is described as merely a control unit (see col. 14, lines 42-51) and as a data source (col. 13, line 67 – col. 14, line 1). That is, Edens neither discloses nor suggests that the multimedia PC 170 receives decompressed data for playback, and accordingly the multimedia PC 170 is incapable as being construed as the claimed playback transducer.

Claim 15

Amended claim 15 recites an optical ring network for use in a motor vehicle. It is respectfully submitted that amended claim 15 is patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 6.

Claim 20

It is respectfully submitted that amended claim 20 is patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 6.

Claim 20 was added in an Amendment mailed to the PTO on June 20, 2006. While the current Official Action on PTO form PTOL-326 indicates that claim 20 currently stands rejected, the current Official Action lacks any explicit arguments regarding the rejection. Nevertheless, in the telephone interview of January 16, 2007 noted above, the Examiner indicated that claim 20 currently stands rejected for the same reasoning as claim 6. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claim 20 is patentable for at least the same reasons as claims 6 and 15.

For all the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 6-20 is respectfully requested.

If a telephone interview could assist in the prosecution of this application, please call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Patrick J. O'Shea

Registration No. 35,305

O'Shea, Getz & Kosakowski, P.C.

1500 Main Street, Suite 912

Springfield, Massachusetts 01115

Telephone: (413) 731-3100, x102